REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-21, and 23-36 are pending. Claims 1, 10, 18, and 27 have been amended to define more clearly what Applicants regard as their invention. Claim 36 has been added to assure Applicants of a full measure of protection of the scope to which they deem themselves entitled. Claims 1, 10, 18, 27, and 30-33 are in independent form. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

It is again noted that the Office Action does not acknowledge clearly that a certified copy of the French priority document has been received. A certified copy of the priority document was received by the Patent and Trademark Office on October 28, 2003. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to acknowledge clearly that a certified copy of the priority document has been received.

Claims 1-4, 6-21, and 23-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0027994 to *Katayama* in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,184,548 to Wee,.

Claim 1 is directed to a method of scrambling a digital signal, including the steps of decomposing the signal into several regions each containing digital data, and encoding the signal in a format comprising header data specific to each region and which comprise at least one part representing the amplitude of the data of the region considered. The method further includes the step of modifying among the header data specific to at least one region of the signal, the part of the header data representing the amplitude of the

data of the region considered, the modifying resulting in an erroneous value for the amplitude of the data upon decoding.

Among other notable features of Claim 1 are that the modifying results in an erroneous value for the amplitude of the data upon decoding. Support for this feature is provided in the specification at, e.g., page 4, lines 14-21. By virtue of the features of Claim 1, the modification can act as an encryption and can render the modified signal not directly decodable.

The general nature of *Katayama* and *Wee* have been discussed adequately in previous papers, and it is not believed to be necessary to repeat that entire discussion.

At page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner concedes that "*Katayama* does not explicitly teach modifying among the header data specific to at least one region of the signal, the part of the header data representing the amplitude of the data of the region considered." The Examiner asserts that *Wee* teaches such a feature, and the Examiner cites column 16, line 56, through column, 17 line 19, and Figure 20, of *Wee*.

At column 9, lines 23-32 of *Wee*, it is discussed that the progressively encrypted data has the property that the first portion can be decrypted alone, without requiring information from the remainder of the original data. From column 16, line 56, to column 17, line 20, it is mentioned that header data portion 2002 of Fig. 20 may contain information specifying recommended points for truncating the payload portion, i.e. the header data portion may contain information representing potential truncation points 2006, 2008 and 2010.

However, the "truncation points" discussed in *Wee* are not the "header data representing the amplitude of the data of the region considered" recited in Claim 1. The "encrypting" in *Wee* is not the "modifying" of Claim 1. This is because in *Wee* the header data portion may be entirely encrypted, whereas the modifying step of Claim 1 is performed among the header data. In particular, Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "modifying among the header data specific to at least one region of the signal, the part of the header data representing the amplitude of the data of the region considered." Accordingly, by virtue of the features of Claim 1, a part of the header data is encrypted which can render the signal thus modified not directly decodable.

In contrast, the truncation points in *Wee* are used for truncating each data packet at an appropriate cutoff point and the packets thus truncated will contain the appropriate number of bits for each region of the image for the desired quality level, as mentioned from column 8, lines 10-52. Thus, the so-called modification of *Wee*, i.e., the change in truncation points, relates to the quality of the baseline and of the subsequent portions to be decoded from the bitstream; that is, the so-called modification of *Wee*, i.e., the change in truncation points, is part of a current and conventional scalable encoding process. After this, the signal of *Wee* is directly decodable via an appropriate decoder.

Applicants have found nothing in *Kayama* or *Wee*, whether considered either separately or in any permissible combination (if any) that would teach or suggest "encoding the signal in a format comprising header data specific to each region and which comprise at least one part representing the amplitude of the data of the region considered,"

and "modifying among the header data specific to at least one region of the signal, the part of the header data representing the amplitude of the data of the region considered, said modifying resulting in an erroneous value for the amplitude of the data upon decoding of the data", as recited in Claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is patentable over the cited art, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Independent Claims 10, 18, and 27 recite certain features which are similar in many relevant respects to those discussed above in connection with Claim 1, and therefore Claims 10, 18, and 27 are believed to be patentable over the cited art as well. Independent Claims 30-33 also include a feature similar to that discussed above, in which a digital signal includes a header with "one part representing the amplitude of the data of the region considered," which is modified. Furthermore, Claims 10, 27, 31, and 33 include the feature of "modifying in reverse the modified part of the header data in order to restore the unmodified part of the header data of the signal." Therefore, those claims also are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above.

The other rejected claims in this application depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and, therefore, are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim also is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Raymond A. DiPerna/
Raymond A. DiPerna
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 44,063

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 2254609v1